App F IX 4

*Previous References*
1195-33(1-2)
178-32(3-4)

*Later References*
2434 34(15)

Preserve

(193 2 / Me) File No 178-32
Serial Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8

PRESERVED

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

*Serial Nos* 7 to 11

**Part B for** January 35

**SUBJECT**

Waiving the establishment, tools and plant Charges on the estimate for laying sub main No 2 of the city underground drainage

To 8) The Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore city

WD 01965—GPB—15 000—7 7-34

Ref L 5159 dated 31-1-35

I take that the work cannot be treated as plant work & the levy of the establishment, tools Plant charges cannot be waived

L 3761

Serial No

5- Letter No Ir Dn. 259 M.I.T 2-1-34 from Executive Engineer, Comm. Bangalore City forwarding copy of letter No. A 32 M.Sh 2-2-1/31 from the Sanitary Engineer Bureau of Sanitary Engineering stating that in the absence of definite orders specifying the percentage of Supervision Charges, the Bureau has been charging 10% Supervision and Tools & Plant Charges on the outlay in connection with the estimate for laying Salmon pipes, City drainage and requesting that the work may be treated as a major State Sanitary Engineering work to which the Municipality contributes half the cost, as otherwise the Bureau Tools & Plant Charges may be waived as a special case

1 The Commr states that in view of the emergent nature of the work, the entire cost of the scheme is met by the municipality in the first instance and in the existing state of the finances the levy of E&S, Tools & Plant Charges will be an additional burden

2 The general question of waiving E&S Tools & Plant charges on works relating to Local Bodies is separately under consideration in the Financial Br.

3 The Financial Secy may if approved be consulted

Submitted for orders

5- It is stated in the Sanitary Engr's letter dated 18/2/34 that the Original Estimate does not provide for

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-32

File No | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No

any Est, Tools & plant charges, and the waiving of even 18% charges is the alternative prayer of the Municipality if the work cannot be treated as a major Sanitary Engg work to absorb the municipality contribution to the CoA

Financial Secy may be consulted

Chief Secy) DR&R 14/2/34

CHIEF SEC'S
14 FEB. 1934

Fin'l Secy) RG 10/2 DR&R 15-2-34

H 2386/16 2-34

RG 14/3/34

The work cannot be treated as a Government work and the proposal to waive the recovery of Establishment and Tools and Plant Charges is also no financially acceptable since it will lead to increase of expenditure under 24 Civil Works

DR 17/3

1) The Comr may be told accordingly

RG 17 3 34

RG 22/3/34

SECOND M
23 MAR 1934
NO 4093

II Month

2) In what stage is the question of reducing the cantage charges from 18%

Fin'l Secy) RG 27/3 DR 28/3/34

D O No A1-74/34 35

Office of the Municipal Commissioner,
Bangalore, Dated 5th August 1934

549

Dear sir,

May I invite your reference to this office letter No 259 dated 7th February 1934 requesting that the levy of 18% supervision charges on the estimate for the laying of sub-main No 2 of the City Drainage sanctioned in Government order No L 4420-3 M1 178-32-2 dated 4th January 1933 may be waived &c?. I request the favour of your obtaining early orders of Government in the matter as the Sanitary Engineer writes that the work cannot be completed until definite orders of Government are passed in the matter

Yours sincerely,

R Ranga Rao, Esq, B A, B L,
Chief Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

11 connected file was submitted to Jnl Secy on 27 3 34

Submitted 9/8/34

12 Please remind the Sec of the Jnl Secy

13 This is about the 3rd or 4th time a reference to the old file alleged to be pending in the Fin. Dept is made

14 The file bearing No 3761 received on 27 3 34 in the Fin Dept has been returned on 19 4 34 to the D.S.G. & has been acknowledged also on that day.

this file is with the Secy.

29/8/34

Executive Engineer

L3761 ✓ 5249 ✓ 3761 ! 808

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No 178 of 1932 | [App F III—2

| Serial No | |
|---|---|
| | This was taken up with the manufacturers and will be taken up shortly MW 20/9/34 |
| | OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF COUNCIL 20 SEPT 1934 No 22644 |
| 11 | The connected file has since been obtained and submitted for orders Ref Para (10) Supra for 14/9 (II Member) dtn 20/9 18 I agree with the Chief Sec'y's note dy 22 3-34 — dtn 22/9 MW MS 19 x+ Plan put up draft dtn 24/9 |
| | 28 SEP 1934 [rec'd 25/9] |
| 10 | Submitted with a draft for approval by 25/9 AH/25/9 Issue dtn 27/9 |
| 6 | One Municipal Commr, Bangalore city No L 2417 dated 29-9-34 States that the work cannot be treated as a Govt Work & that the Tools & Plant charges cannot be waived |
| 7 | Letter No A1-74/34-35 dated 26-10-34 from the Municipal Commissioner Bangalore city requesting a reconsideration of the orders passed Submitted for orders Rsmr 10/11/34 MW 10/11/1934 4 It seems the question of the reduction of the rates of Tools & Plant charges was considered at the last meeting of Officers Please obtain & put up an Extract of the Proceedings relating to this subject dtn 13/11 |

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12 10-33

It is informally ascertained from the Revenue Branch that the proceedings have not yet been approved

Serial No

Hon. L. Members

Rejn 14/11

The Mun Com requests reconsideration of the order passed declining to waive the Sewage Pumping Plant charges in respect of the underground drainage work recently executed in the Mey. or to treat it as a major State Engineering work please see para 8, 9 & 18 Supra — — —

The grounds for reconsideration urged by the Mun Com are —

(i) That the Mc Cl have advanced the whole of the cost of the work viz. Rs 64,300 (against the estimate of Rs 50,000) in the first instance though half the cost have been held the cost

(ii) That the said charges were not included in the original estimate & the Mc Cl were not intimated that they had been the charges in which case they would have undertaken the work themselves and

(iii) That the charges levied would increase the cost of the work by nearly 20 %, which the Mc Cl are unable to meet in their present condition of finance

The waiving of the charges, even as a special case, may not be possible in the existing financial condition whether the rate of the charges can be reduced may perhaps be considered It is understood that the question of reducing the rate in general was discussed at the recent meeting of Revs at Mysore what opinion was expressed in regard to the reduction of the rate from 10% to 8% or 9%

Serial No

CHIEF SECRETARY 16 NOV 1934

For orders
cmeetings
Asst 16/11

For favour of remarks
RSG 19/11/34
Asst 19/11

Secy to PWD +
Asst Secy with compliments

Passed on with compliments

2 It is not desirable to waive the Establishment and Tools and Plant charges altogether A reduction of the charges somewhat on the basis of the decision, arrived at in the Officers' meeting may, however be considered

No PWD 235/34-35 22/11/34

No PWD 85/34-35 8/12/34

Financial Secretary / with compliments 6/12/34

for 6/12 SB 17/12/34

Fe 1185 10/12/34

The actual expenditure incurred by the P W D towards Establishment and Tools and Plant charges works up to 20% of the total works outlay The present rate viz 18% charged to individual works is therefore not high and any reduction of this low rate will be an incorrect representation of the accounts and fact

NOTE—Contn Sheet

1500
7

Mr File No 178 of 1932 | General and Revenue Secretariat

and result in increase in expenditure under 24 Civil Works' and is not financially acceptable

The Municipality seems to think that Government have to bear half the cost in all such cases This is not correct This is the maximum contribution which Government can make and it is not obligatory on the part of Government to give this contribution in each case

H 1185

I agree
28/1
31/1/35 Please put up a draft reply stating that Govt regret that they are unable to recommend the order already passed

Draft submitted
31/1/35

For perusal before issue
(11 Members)

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
7 JAN 1935
No. 417

1/2/1935

1935

To the Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore city
No 2 51,59 dated 31-1-35
Regret it is not possible to recommend the order already passed

B
7/2

3761

CITY MUNICIPAL OFFICE

No G To 259/Sec one

*Bangalore City Dated* 5th February 193 4

mel 178-32-5

FROM

P H KRISHNA RAU, ESQ, M A
MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE CITY

To

R Panga Pao, Esq , B A ,B L ,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE

SECRETARIAT 7 FEB

Sir,

With reference to G O No L 4420-3 M 178-32-2 dated 4-1-1933 sanctioning the scheme for Rs 50,000/- for laying sub-main No 2 of the City drainage for disposal of the sullage from Seshadri Road, Subedar Chatr Road and portions of Balepet and Chickpet, I have the honour to state that the amount was placed at the disposal of the State Sanitary Engineering Department and the work is almost completed

The Sanitary Engineer in his letter No 127 dated - 22-1-1934 (copy enclosed), says that in the absence of definite Government Orders specifying the percentage of supervision charges the Comptroller to the Government of Mysore has been levying 18% supervision and tools and plant/ charges on the outlay

In the estimates originally sent to the Municipal Council and the Government no such charges were included If such a charge is now included the cost of the work would be increased by nearly 20%

In this connection I may be permitted to state that the Municipal Council were all along requesting the Government to bear the entire cost of the drainage works and have now agreed, in view of the emergent nature of the work, to meet the entire cost of this portion of the Scheme in the first instance As

such this additional charge on the scheme would be a great burden on the Municipality especially in view of the present state of its finances and its recent heavy committments with regard to Water Supply Etc

I therefore request that the work may be treated as a major State Sanitary Engineering Work to which the Municipality contributes half the cost If this is not possible the levy of 18 supervision charges on the estimated cost of the Works may waived as a special case

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Municipal Commissioner

Forwarded with compliments,

President

D P[illegible] OF [illegible]

Bureau of Sanitary Engineering

"Grace Ville" Palace Road,

D O 127 Bangalore, dated 22rd January, 1934

Dear Mr Krishna Rau,

I wish to enclose herein a copy of D O Letter No 857 dated 15-7-33 which I wrote to the President of the Municipality and to request you to kindly let me know what action has been taken in the matter In the absence of definite Government Order specifying the percentage of supervision charges, the - Comptroller has been levying 18 per cent on the outla The original estimate does not provide for ry establishment, tools and plant charges The inclusion o this will certainly result in the suspersion of further wor

Hoping to get an early reply in the matter

Yours sincerly,

Sd/- B P Garudachar,

Sanitary Engineer

"copy"

Municipal Commissioner

LSV

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Diary No of letter replied to 1579

General and Revenue Secretariat

( Rev )

tne 193

Date of ssue 29/9/34

Signed by Mr A Subba Rao

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Section Rev

File No 178-32

Serial No 6

No L 2417

To

The Municipal Commr

Bangalore city

( Vice President)

Sir

With reference to your letter no L To 259 | D 7/2/34 stating that in the absence of definite orders specifying the percentage of supervision charges the Government has been levying on supervision and lift plant charges on the outlay in connection with the estimate for re laying Subway no 2 of the city drainage and requesting that the work may

be treated as a major State Govt
or
Engineering work, as otherwise the
levy of tools & plant charges may
be waived as a special case, I
am directed to state that the work
cannot be treated as a Govt work
and that the proposal to waive the
recovery of T&P charges
is also not financially acceptable
as it will lead to increase of expenditure
under "20 Civil Works"

I have etc

Asst
for Chief Engineer

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. L 2417/mul 178-32 Bangalore Dated 28/29 - 9 - 1934

*From*

R Rama Rao, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,
*Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

*To*

M Sesnadri, Esquire, M.A.,
Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore City

THROUGH THE PRESIDENT, CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, BANGALORE

Sir

With reference to your letter No G To 259 dated the 7th February 1934 stating that in the absence of definite orders specifying the percentage of supervision charges, the Comptroller has been levying 18 per cent supervision and tools and plant charges on the outlay in connection with the estimate for relaying submain No 2 of the City Drainage and requesting that the work may be treated as a major State Sanitary Engineering work, or the levy of tools and plant charges may be waived as a special case, I am directed to state that the work cannot be treated as a Government work and that the proposal to waive the recovery of the ~~Establishment~~ Establishment, tools and plant charges is also not financially acceptable, as it will lead to increase of expenditure under " 24 Civil Works "

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government

Ml 178-32-7

No A1-74/34-35

City Municipal Office

*Dated, Bangalore* 24th/26 Oct 193 4

1608/L

FROM

M Seshadri, Esq , M A ,
Municipal Commissioner
Bangalore City

To

Rajasevasaktha
R Ranga Rao, Esq , B A , B L ,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore

L 3 K
27 OCT

Sir

With reference to your letter No L 2417 Ml 178-32 dated 29th September 1934 stating that the proposal to waive the recovery of the Tools & Plant and Establishment charges amounting to 18% on the estimated cost of laying the under-ground drainage to lead off the sewage from the new Jail extension &c I have the honor to state as follows -

1 The sites in the new jail extension were formed by Government and the site value realised amounting to more than Rs 2 00,000 was credited to State Funds The State Public Works Department prepared an estimate for Rs 13,000 for laying underground drainage to this extension

2 It was mainly to divert this sewage from Subedar Chatram road to the main drain in Sultarpet that the laying of sub main No 2 of the comprehensive drainage scheme was undertaken by the unicipality

Though it has always been understood that Government should bear half the cost of the drainage works, the Municipality undertook to carry out the works as a municipal work in the first instance the question of the proportion of cost to be met by Government and the time as to when this quota should be paid to the Municipality being left to Government to be settled later on when the financial corditions improve (vide Govt order No L 4420-3 Ml 178-32-2 dated 4th January 1933)

3 Though the scheme was estimated to cost only Rs 5,0000 the revised estimate actually amounts to Rs 64,300/- (exclusive of Tools and Plant charges) and the full amount has already been placed at the disposal of the State Sanitary Engineer

4 In the origiral estimates sent by the Sanitary Department, no such charges were included If the fact had been intimated to the Municipality the Municipality itself would have undertaken the work.

5 I may also be permitted to bring to the notice of - - Government that though the Municipality has already spent Rs 64,300/- for the City drainage works, Government have not found it possible to make any contribution towards the cost of the work Even this year Government have not been pleased to make any provision for the purpose in the current year's budget ( vide Govt letter No L 877 M1 195-33-2 dated 3rd August 1934) flag G

-In view of the foregoing facts and especially in view of the fact that the finances of the Municipality are very much crippled and according to the sanctioned budget of the Muricipality for 1934-35, there is hardly a sum of Rs 50,000 for the Municipal Engineering works, I request the favour of your obtaining the sanction of Government for waiving the levy of Tools & Plant and Establishment charges on the drainage estimate already worked out as a special case

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

M Sahadeva
Municipal Commissioner.

ss

Forwarded with compliments

Hon President

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

*Diary No of letter replied to*

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* *193*

Date of issue 31/1/35

Signed by Mr A J R

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Section MC

File No 178-32

Serial No 8

No L 5179

To

The Municipal Commissioner
Bangalore city
( through the President)

Sir

With reference to your letter No A1-34/34-35 dated 26-10-34 requesting, ~~for reasons given~~ sanction for waiving as a special case the levy of establishment and tools and plant charges on the estimate for ~~for laying the underground drainage to lead off the sewage from the ocean~~ ~~foul Extension~~ laying sub mains No 2 of the city underground drainage, I am directed to state that Govt regret that it is not possible to recommend the order already passed in the matter

I have etc

~~for Secy to Govt~~ Chief Secy to Govt

RM AH

WD 01956—GPB—22 590—12 6-34

**GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE**

**General and Revenue Secretariat**

**Bangalore Dated** 16th January 193 5

No 25159/Misc 178-32-8 Sec

*From*

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

*To*

The Municipal Commissioner
BANGALORE CITY
(Through the President)

*Sir*

With reference to your letter No A 1-74/34-35 dated 26th October 1934 requesting sanction for - - - waiving, as a special case, the levy of establishment and tools and plant charges on the estimate for laying sub main No 2 of the City underground drainage I am directed to state that Government regret that it is not possible to reconsider the order already passed in the matter

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

For Chief Secretary to Government

V L